

REMARKS

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1-20 and 22-24 were pending in this application. No claims have been added, canceled, or amended. Therefore, claims 1-20 and 22-24 remain presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

Examiner Interview

As an initial matter, Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview on February 25, 2005. As discussed with the Examiner, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable as the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the recitations of the claims. These recitations are discussed in more detail below.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections, Kangasharju

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 14-15, 17-18 and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kangasharju (hereinafter "Kangasharju"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites "a server... including a plurality of content objects" and first and second content exchanges which each comprise subsets of content portions of the plurality of content objects. The subsets of content portions were obtained from the server. A first datalink transports a first catalog of the first subset between the content exchange and the server. Similarly, a second datalink transports a second catalog of the second subset between the second content exchange and the server.

As stated in the office action, Kangasharju fails to teach or suggest data links that transport catalogs from content exchanges to the server from which the content exchanges obtained the objects. Instead, the Examiner appears to be relying on Official Notice to teach these recitations. Applicants respectfully object to the Official Notice taken in the Office Action and request objective proof of the propositions set forth therein as required by MPEP 2144.03.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Kangasharju motivates or suggests content exchanges that transport catalogs to the server from which content objects were obtained. Kangasharju teaches a caching system that includes a location data system. Kangasharju, p. 3, ¶ 3. The LDS is a networking application that maintains mappings between URLs and servers that contain the URL. Id. Each URL has one (or more) authoritative location servers, which contains a list of resource records for the URL. Id. at p. 3, col. 2, ¶ 2. When a cache caches a new object, it sends a message to the authoritative location server responsible for the object (URL) indicating the object has been cached. Id. at p. 5, col. 2, ¶ 3. The authoritative location server merely maintains mappings between URL's and the servers on which the URL's are located. In contrast to claim 1, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kangasharju that the authoritative location server originates content objects.

As Kangasharju fails to teach or suggest all of the recitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-4, 6, 7, and 22-24 depend from claim 1 and are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 8 recites transporting a catalog determined at a first content exchange to a first remote location of a first server from which content object portions were obtained. As discussed above, Kangasharju fails to teach or suggest transporting a catalog from a content exchange to a server from which the content objects were obtained. Accordingly, claim 8 and dependent claims 9-14 are believed to be allowable.

Claim 15 recites receiving, at a content server, a content catalog of content object portions from a first remote computer. The first content object portions were obtained by the first remote computer from the content server. As Kangasharju fails to teach or suggest this recitation, claim 15 and dependent claims 17-18 are also believed to be allowable.

Applicants also respectfully submit that the claims are allowable for additional reasons. For instance, claim 6 recites the first datalink transports status information relating to the first content exchange. Kangasharju discloses that a cache may update the LDS when it stores and evicts content objects. Applicants respectfully submit that updating the LDS cannot be equated to transporting status information relating to the content exchange.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection, Kangsharju, Chase

Claims 5, 9, 11, 13, 16, 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kangasharju in view of EP 0 877 326 A2 issued to Chase et al. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited portions of Kangasharju in view of the cited portions of European Patent No. EP 0 847 020 A2 to Tsirigotis et al. (hereinafter "Tsirigotis"). These claims depend on claim 1, 8, or 15. As Chase and Tsirigotis also fail to teach or suggest transporting to a server (or receiving at the server) catalogs of subsets of content object portions obtained from the server, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable.


INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

If there remains any issues of allowance with this application, Applicants respectfully request a telephone interview with the Examiner. Applicants' representative, Melissa Haapala, may be telephoned at (303) 571-4000.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Melissa A. Haapala
Reg. No. 47,622

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
M2H:nlm
60391657 v1